

# **EXHIBIT D**

**EXHIBIT D**  
**DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS SUBJECT TO REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT**

<b><u>ECF No.</u></b>	<b><u>Dispositive Motion</u></b>
ECF Nos. 3008, 3006, 3032, 3108	FTAIA-Related Motions for Summary Judgment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motion for Summary Judgment Based Upon Plaintiffs’ Failure to Distinguish Between Actionable and Non-Actionable Damages Under the FTAIA (ECF No. 3008)</li> <li>• Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs’ Indirect Purchaser Claims Based on Foreign Sales (ECF No. 3006)</li> <li>• Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on FTAIA Grounds (ECF No. 3032)</li> <li>• Motion for Summary Judgment Based Upon Failure to Provide Evidence to Avoid FTAIA Bar on Foreign Commerce (ECF No. 3108)</li> </ul>
ECF No. 3014	Motion for Partial Summary Judgment with Respect to DAPs’ Alleged Direct Damage Claims Based on Purchases from SANYO
ECF No. 3174	Defendants’ Joint Notice of Motion and Motion to Exclude Certain Expert Testimony of Professor Kenneth Elzinga
ECF No. 3558	Motion to Establish the Preclusive Effect of, or in the Alternative Admit, the Decision of the European Commission (DAP MIL No. 11) <sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Although Direct Action Plaintiffs (“DAPs”) filed DAP MIL No. 11 as a motion in limine, DAPs’ motion is effectively a summary-judgment motion because DAPs seek in that motion judgment as a matter of law on all dispositive issues (other than damages), against numerous Defendants in this case based on the purported preclusive effective of the Decision of the European Commission. Thus, in light of its importance, and because DAPs should have filed their MIL No. 11 as a summary-judgment motion, Defendants respectfully request oral argument regarding the motion.